

Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting

Wednesday, June 25, 2003

6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Burton Barr Central Library

1221 North Central Avenue, 4th Floor Lecture Room
Phoenix

MINUTES

Members in attendance:

Hildellred Chambers Add
Dr. Ruth Ann Marsten

ADEQ Staff in attendance:

Kris Kommalan, ADEQ Project Manager
John Kivett, ADEQ Hydrologist
Phil McNeely, ADEQ Superfund Programs Manager
Patrick Gibbons, ADEQ Media Relations Coordinator
Tina Wesoloskie, ADEQ Community Involvement
Coordinator
Alex Zavala, ADEQ Community Involvement Coordinator
Monica Mascareno, ADEQ Community Involvement
Coordinator

EPA Staff in attendance:

Nadia Hollan, EPA Project Manager
Viola Cooper, EPA Community Involvement Coordinator
Arnold Den, EPA Senior Science Advisor
Alvin Chun, USPHS

Health Services Staff in attendance:

Will Humble, Chief, Office of Environmental Health,
Arizona Department of Health Services
Alvin Chun, U.S. Public Health Services

Others in attendance:

Tom Suriano
Amy Boyes
Ward Jacox
Michael R.
Will Humble (Arizona Dept of Health Services)
Vasanti Deshpande
Jerry D. Worsham
Sally Vander Laer
Joe Gibbs
Vera Figueroa
Gladys Lopez
Rene Chase Dufault
Mary Moore
Nancy Nesky
Sharen Meade
Barbara H. Murphy
Ken Carlson
Steve Whillier
Vincie Muhammad
Marvin Martin
Cathy Esposito
Amy Halm
Martha Breitenbach
Tom Mooney
Terry Lockwood
Peter Storch
Stan Jolliffe
Anna Jolliffe
Manuel Portillo
Marilyn Lincoln
Patricia Zemko

CIU #04-025

Preface: The actual meeting time for this meeting went until 8:30 p.m. to allow for sufficient time to discuss Motorola's proposal and to address the community's concerns. As a result, several of the agenda items were postponed until the next meeting (see below for details).

1. Welcome and Introductions - Tina Wesoloskie

Tina Wesoloskie, ADEQ Community Involvement Coordinator, opened the meeting. All ADEQ staff, EPA staff, Company Representatives, CAG members, and audience members introduced themselves. Ms. Wesoloskie briefly reviewed the meeting agenda and informed audience that due to the lengthy agenda, some items may have to be postponed until the next meeting in a few weeks. Ms. Wesoloskie also informed the audience that due to the nature of the agenda items, the meeting may last until 8:30 p.m. (must close at this time to allow for room cleanup since the Library closes at 9pm), if the community supports this. The community did support this decision, if it became necessary. Ms. Wesoloskie also requested that the presentation by Mr. Will Humble, Arizona Department of Health Services (ADHS), be moved up on the agenda to immediately follow the presentation by Tom Suriano, Motorola, since it is directly related to Motorola's proposal. The community accepted this rescheduling of the agenda items.

2. *OUI Update: Proposal to Eliminate Air Emission Controls (Tom Suriano, Motorola); ADEQ Requirements to Remove Air Emissions Controls and Request for Public Comment (ADEQ)*

Tom Suriano, Motorola, opened his presentation by informing the audience that a small amount of condensation was observed during a regeneration cycle of the primary vapor phase granular activated carbon (GAC) air controls. A subsequent investigation revealed a hairline crack in the GAC vessel and the groundwater treatment system was shut down immediately. Motorola notified ADEQ of the condition of the system on April 2, 2003. Mr. Suriano briefly explained the process involved in extracting the groundwater and the use of the air controls in the current system (prior to the crack). Motorola has investigated the cost of replacing the air emission controls, and estimates this to be approximately \$30,000 - \$45,000 in construction costs plus an additional \$95,000 - \$125,000 in annual operations and maintenance costs. Motorola has also investigated the Maricopa County Air Rules and EPA guidelines for air emissions from similar treatment systems. Based on this information, Motorola submitted a proposal to the ADEQ (dated May 9, 2003) requesting that Motorola be allowed to resume extraction and treatment of the groundwater without replacing the fatigued vessels (air emission controls).

Mr. Suriano described the existing process flow diagram (see meeting handout) to treat the groundwater and air emissions. Mr. Suriano also explained that the long term operation of the interim groundwater treatment system (IGTS) has reduced the overall concentration of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), primarily trichloroethene (TCE), in the groundwater. Mr. Suriano indicated that the initial groundwater VOC concentration entering the system in 1992 was approximately 2,130 micrograms per liter (ug/l) or parts per billion (ppb). According to Mr. Suriano, the current total VOC concentration coming into the IGTS is 541 ppb. Mr. Suriano also indicated that his technical staff estimates that the groundwater contamination is moving at less than one foot per day.

Based on Motorola's calculations, Motorola estimates that the IGTS would emit approximately 1.6 to 1.85 pounds per day (lbs/day) of total VOCs into the air if the system were allowed to operate without the use of air emission controls. According to Motorola, this would be less than the 3 lbs/day maximum allowed by current Maricopa County rules. Mr. Suriano indicated that the proposal to remove the existing air emission controls was submitted to ADEQ; however, Motorola wants to ensure that the public health is protected. Mr. Suriano went on to say that Motorola was providing this information to the public tonight in an effort to get feedback from the community as to what concerns or issues may be present. The decision to eliminate the air emission controls has not been definitely made at this point.

Mr. Phil McNeely, ADEQ Superfund Programs Section Manager, briefly spoke at the conclusion of Mr. Suriano's presentation to state that ADEQ wanted Motorola to replace the air emission controls. Ms. Kris

Kommalan, ADEQ Project Manager, acknowledged that she was in receipt of Motorola's proposal and was reviewing all of the documentation submitted. Ms. Kommalan also indicated that ADEQ wanted to hear what the public's response was to Motorola's presentation here this evening prior to making a decision on the proposal.

Ms. Kommalan briefly discussed Motorola's existing requirements under various agreements. In summary, the 1987 OU1 Feasibility Study states that the specific technical objectives for on-site remediation are to obtain source control or containment and limit exposure to contaminated air emissions during treatment. In addition, the 1989 Consent Decree for the Site states the air stripping towers will be equipped with air emission controls. The Consent Decree states that these controls are required as needed to meet Maricopa County requirements, including Rule 320, Section 302, and any other provisions of the Arizona Implementation Plan under the Clean Air Act.

NOTE: Throughout Mr. Suriano's presentation, numerous questions were asked by the audience. These questions and the corresponding answers have been included as an attachment to these minutes in an effort to make the minutes more easily understood.

3. *Vapor Intrusion Pathway & Trichloroethene (TCE) Toxicity Re-Assessment – Will Humble, ADHS (Moved up from original agenda)*

Mr. Will Humble, Arizona Department of Health Services, introduced the topic of evaluating vapor intrusion from Groundwater into Indoor Air. By using illustrations (see meeting handout), Mr. Humble described how contaminants in the groundwater can migrate into the subsurface (soil beneath a structure such as a house or office) and travel through the construction materials into a structure. The extent to which this happens, as explained by Mr. Humble, is dependent on several things, including the mass of contaminant in the groundwater, the type of contamination in the groundwater, the type of soil beneath the structure, and the type of construction used to build the structure, i.e., does the structure have a basement, does the structure have a crawl space, or does the structure sit on a concrete slab.

Mr. Humble described the three ways that scientists can quantify inhalation of contamination in vapors. Basically, these ways include the following, listed from least accurate to most accurate: (1) estimate the evaporation of pollutants out of the groundwater, into the soil gas, through the structure's foundation, and into the house; (2) measure the amount of pollutant in the soil gas and estimate how much gets through the foundation and into the house; and (3) directly measure the pollutant in the indoor air and outdoor air at the same time over an extended period of time.

Mr. Humble stated that the process used by ADHS in the 1992 risk assessment for this site was #2 described above, measuring the soil gas and estimating the potential concentration of contaminants into structures. Based on the method, ADHS predicted negligible migration of TCE into homes from the contaminated groundwater. Mr. Humble discussed the various uncertainties inherent in any scientific model because you always need to make some assumptions. Much research has been done over the years to try and more accurately predict pollutant migration in to homes.

Mr. Humble discussed EPA's approach to evaluate potential problems associated with vapor intrusion. As explained by Mr. Humble and Ms. Nadia Hollan, EPA Project Manager, EPA uses a three level or "tiered" approach. The first tier (Primary) screens for potential problems. At this level, EPA and scientists evaluate

whether the contamination at the site has the potential to migrate into the air. The second tier (Secondary) takes those sites that pass the first tier and uses a model to estimate diffusion. The third tier (Site Specific) uses indoor air and/or subslab measurements to quantify the potential vapor intrusion concentrations. Mr. Humble offered an EPA website for some new guidance in this area <http://www.epa.gov/correctiveaction/eis/vapor.htm>.

The second portion of Mr. Humble's presentation addressed the new research being done to evaluate the toxicity of TCE. Mr. Humble briefly explained how TCE was used in industry as a cleaner, but also in medicine as an anesthetic. According to Mr. Humble, the available information on the toxicity of TCE to workers is fairly reliable. However, studies relating to environmental exposures (low levels) to TCE have been inconclusive. EPA has not adopted a final toxicity screening value for TCE at this time. However, a work group has developed provisional screening levels that have been incorporated into the vapor intrusion guidance (see EPA's website provided above). The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) has an intermediate inhalation Minimal Risk Level of 0.1 parts per million in air.

NOTE: Throughout Mr. Humble's presentation, numerous questions were asked by the audience. These questions and the corresponding answers have been included as an attachment to these minutes in an effort to make the minutes more easily understood.

4. *OU2 Update*

This agenda item was not discussed. Discussion on this agenda item was postponed until the next CAG meeting to be held in the near future.

5. *OU3 Update*

This agenda item was not discussed. Discussion on this agenda item was postponed until the next CAG meeting to be held in the near future.

6. *Honeywell Monitoring Well Installation Progress; Honeywell Bioventing Pilot Study Update*

This agenda item was not discussed. Discussion on this agenda item was postponed until the next CAG meeting to be held in the near future.

7. *Community Involvement Plan Update*

This agenda item was not discussed. Discussion on this agenda item was postponed until the next CAG meeting to be held in the near future.

8. *Discussion of New CAG Members*

This agenda item was not discussed. Discussion on this agenda item was postponed until the next CAG meeting to be held in the near future.

9. **Call to the Public*

No additional questions were asked during the final call to the public. Patrick Gibbons, ADEQ Media Relations Coordinator, announced that Tina Wesoloskie and Alex Zavala have accepted new positions outside of ADEQ. He and the audience thanked them for their efforts and wished them well in their new careers.

10. *Future Meeting Plans*

Due to a majority of agenda items needing to be postponed, the next CAG meeting will be held in approximately 4-6 weeks. No specific time was set for this meeting; however, everyone on the mailing list will

receive a copy of the agenda for the next CAG meeting which will provide the meeting details.

*Please contact Kris Kommalan at (602) 771-4193 for all information concerning the site. After a new Community Involvement Coordinator has been hired and trained, you will be provided with new contact information.

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Tom Suriano's Presentation

Page 1 of 8

Question	Response
How long before air stripper is back on-line?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> The groundwater treatment system can be back on-line in 2 weeks after a decision has been made.
Where is the system located? Where on the facility? Near the lunchroom?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Located on the former Motorola 52 nd Street facility. Located on the north side, west of center. (Reference was also made to a map of the site which depicted the approximate location of the treatment system)
How many pounds will be emitted?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Approximately 1.8 lbs/day
If you're that low, why did they make you put the system on in the first place?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> We'll be coming to that, but conditions have changed from when the original system was installed.
When you're evaluating cost efficiency (referring to \$17,500/ton on slide presentation), is this cost efficiency based on an on-going business where your producing a product or are these reference cost efficiency values (dollar amounts) for remediation where you've been ordered to clean up?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Guidelines for establishing evaluation of cost for process. Used to evaluate whether or not controls are necessary.
An audience member thought that Motorola reduced the size of the tanks to save on cost. The audience member believed that the tanks should last 30 years and these tanks have failed in only 11-12 years.	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Cost will be a factor, but health protectiveness is Motorola's primary concern.
What happened in January 2002 – treatment system was only up for about 3 days? (Referring to charts in Motorola's slide presentation)	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola was doing an aquifer recovery test

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Will Humble's Presentation

Page 1 of 3

Question	Response
What type of home data was used? There are different building codes between a home that is built in Arizona versus a home that is built in New York.	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> When you model there are uncertainties. Not sure which state's home data was used at this time, but he could check.
Does this mean that houses that are above contaminated water have passed through the primary screen?	Nadia Hollan responded: Yes. This is EPA's position. We want to evaluate whether or not it's a problem still. Groundwater levels could be really low or really high. It is more likely for contaminants to migrate into a house if the groundwater level is high (closer to the ground surface). It also depends on what type of contamination is present in the groundwater. Scientists need to evaluate if the particular contaminant at a site has the capability of migrating into the soil.
Are we looking at this because the conditions are the same but now we have new tools to evaluate the conditions?	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> Tools are more sophisticated. We're also re-looking at this because TCE has been re-evaluated based on toxicity. The toxicity information for TCE is newer and different than the toxicity information that was used in the 1992 health risk assessment.
Won't you have volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in your indoor air samples that may result from VOCs that are in paint?	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> This is possible. 1,1-DCE is not in household items/products, so this may be used as a tracer. (Nadia)
How does this presentation relate to our homes where some homes are not on slabs but are built with crawl spaces and/or basements?	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> Any new study would accommodate for this. There are different equations used to calculate probable indoor air concentrations from soil concentrations base on the type of subflooring. However, if actual indoor air samples are collected, then it does not matter what type of subflooring you have because we are collecting actual samples and not trying to predict vapors through a subflooring.
What about "today's" evaluation? Would you use current or new information?	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> We would use the appropriate model or use actual indoor air samples.

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Will Humble's Presentation

Page 2 of 3

Question	Response
Lived in area for 6 years. Son developed dystonia, out of the blue, which is uncontrolled movements, liver problems. There is no family history. It's very interesting that some of these studies show that TCE can cause these same effects.	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> Studies at low levels (low doses) are inconclusive. The studies that showed these same effects were those conducted on workers that were exposed to large doses of TCE.
I know you've said that the studies on TCE are various shades of gray. If darker grey is more toxic than thought in 1992 and lighter gray is less toxic than thought to have been in 1992, are we darker gray or lighter gray?	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> EPA's toxicity number for TCE today is darker grey.
Which numbers count if EPA and Center for Disease Control (CDC) both have different numbers? Which do public health sectors follow?	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> In the health department, we work with CDC numbers, but they can use EPA's numbers. Parent agency for ADHS (ATSDR...Agency for Toxic Substance Disease Registry) uses CDC, but they consult with EPA.
Are they testing people to see what the levels are or are they looking at rats?	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> They look at all of them. Human studies are looked at first, then laboratory studies next, then pharmacokinetic models (cellular analysis) next.
What is looked at for the Motorola 52 nd Street Superfund Site?	<p><i>Nadia Hollan responded:</i> EPA looks at toxicity for acute exposure as well as chronic (cancer) exposures. They look at all health effects both cancer and non-cancer.</p> <p><i>Nadia Hollan responded:</i> EPA wrote ADEQ a recommendation that they look at vapor intrusion.</p> <p><i>Kris Kommalan responded:</i> ADEQ received EPA's letter and concurs that this pathway should be evaluated. ADEQ will be working with Motorola within the next several months to start an assessment at OU1.</p>
Have they found any cancer in the Motorola 52 nd Street Superfund Site area than can be related back to the site?	<i>Will Humble responded:</i> EPA does not take actual blood samples from the local community; we use models.

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

**Final List of Questions & Responses: Will Humble's Presentation
Page 3 of 3**

Question	Response
It is in the best interest for Motorola to spend \$40,000. If people get sick, they could spend a lot more addressing this.	Not a question; no response from anyone.
END OF QUESTIONS & ANSWERS FOR WILL HUMBLE'S PRESENTATION	

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Tom Suriano's Presentation

Page 2 of 8

Question	Response
Why was February 2002 almost ½ the daily flow for the month (gal/day)?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> We were only operating the northern portion of the system as part of a system evaluation.
1.85 lbs/day – Average daily VOC emissions. Was this a weighted average to throw out the skewed data (i.e. Jan 2002 and Feb 2002)?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> I will have to check into this with his engineers.
Question by Jerry Worsham, but could not hear; inaudible question.	There may have been discussion, but the transcription tape was inaudible to evaluate what was said. Furthermore, the person taking notes was unable to hear the question or the response.
Didn't Motorola lower the level of groundwater significantly so you're not getting as much TCE out of the soil?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Valley is seeing a regional drop in the groundwater table due largely in part to the drought. Water level decline is not causing a decline in TCE concentrations. There has been a reduction in mass.
By Motorola using treated waster in their manufacturing operations, has this caused the regional ground water to go down.	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> The decline is due to regional drought. This (using treated water at ON Semiconductor) was always in the plans.
An audience member believed that Motorola had plans for a percolation field at one point.	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Percolation field was not a part of the remediation plan.
How much of total VOCs is TCE?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Aquifer water quality standard is 5 ppb. About 75% of total VOCs is TCE.

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Tom Suriano's Presentation

Page 3 of 8

Question	Response
Concerns about loss of alluvium water; fractured bedrock; lack of monitoring to know what levels of TCE are in bedrock. Will wells be put in to answer these questions?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> That's a whole other presentation. Motorola has a significant number of monitoring wells in alluvium and bedrock. I (Tom Suriano) can get you the data.
Were some wells that were critical lost by freeway construction?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Can we table this so that we can get back to the presentation? (Community member answered yes)
When looking at efficiency, could Motorola use a more efficient technology to get the overall costs down?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Carbon is the best available technology per Maricopa County guidelines.
So are you proposing to bypass the system and directly vent to the air? What would be the TCE levels?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Yes. <i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Wouldn't take any action until air modeling was done.
So the answer to his question is "no"?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> We don't have the information yet.
\$40,000 is a small price to ensure a healthy environment	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> We are here to get community input.
Is Motorola arguing that this treatment plant should be separated out from the rest of the site? Shouldn't emissions from the entire Motorola 52 nd Street Superfund Site be considered?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Yes. No response provided to 2 nd part of question.

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Tom Suriano's Presentation

Page 4 of 8

Question	Response
How much emissions are produced at the Motorola 52 nd Street facility?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> The Motorola 52 nd Street facility is now ON Semiconductor. ON Semiconductor is a separate company with its own permit.
Should Maricopa County standards that apply to industry apply to a cleanup technology?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> There is nothing addressing emissions from cleanup technologies. County standards do not directly apply, but this is the closest thing that we have.
Aren't you creating air emissions that wouldn't be there if you weren't pumping groundwater contaminated with TCE?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> EPA Guidance: air strippers may emit up to 15 lbs/day before using controls.
I have a hard time understanding why you want to eliminate air emission controls in an area where children with asthma is already at a very high rate. I don't know how to explain this to parents in the school district.	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola is here with an open mind. We are here to explain our proposal and hear your concerns.
How long has the data shown that air emissions without treatment would have only been less than 3 lbs/day? Since January 2003?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> I will have to go back and check with the engineers.
If vessels were supposed to last 30 years, isn't this stuff more toxic than you thought?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> I will have to go back and check what the specified life cycle was provided for the vessels. In answer to the second part, the cracking is related to temperature and pressure changes, not the TCE. The metal fatigue is not a corrosion issue.
Would the next step be to put in better tanks so the new tanks would not fatigue in 11 years?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola is looking at all alternatives, including new technology.

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Tom Suriano's Presentation

Page 5 of 8

Question	Response
If you upgrade the technology but use inferior quality, then is it any better and will it keep emissions from going into the air?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola will look at all options.
Is the figure in your presentation showing operations 7 days/wk then divide by 30 days in a month?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Daily average isn't affected by operations uptime. Motorola does correction to actual uptime for the system.
Do you sample for water quality one time? One day a month? How frequently?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola samples more frequently. Motorola takes weekly samples. Motorola has pretty good trend data.
Why not sample water quality data?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Air emissions are monitored daily. Water quality is sampled less frequently.
How many times is water quality sampled?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> 2-4 times per month
How is water sampled?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Grab sample.
<p>Maricopa County Rules: Rule 320 Section 302. Where measures are available, the use of such controls shall be mandatory.</p> <p>Rule 330 Section 306 which Motorola doesn't mention, states that for VOC containment and disposal, no VOCs shall be emitted to the atmosphere.</p> <p>Rule 100 Section 200.58 – Definition of insignificant activity – references Appendix D. Motorola's cleanup activities are not included in this list.</p>	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> I will get all citations from you and will take this back to the company (Motorola).

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Tom Suriano's Presentation

Page 6 of 8

Question	Response
Consent Order – Appendix C. Work to be performed C.1.3.3. Cleanup level; perform interim cleanup of soil and groundwater; no contaminant migration. I would consider transfer of TCE contamination from groundwater to air as “migration of contaminants”. I am also concerned about ambient TCE in structures in area.	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> I will get all citations from you and will take this back to the company (Motorola).
What is the timeline? Who are the decision makers? The whole process appears very loose. I think that there should be a critical path on this.	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola put forth a proposal to ADEQ. <i>Kris Kommalan responded:</i> At this time, the agency is soliciting comments
“Control Officers”...who is this?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> ADEQ is the lead oversight agency in consultation with Maricopa County and EPA.
What other steps do you need to go through? What are other steps? What is the timeline?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola can't speak to ADEQ's decision making process.
Who do you represent? Who, by show of hands, also represents Motorola? Who, by show of hands, is from ADEQ? Who by show of hands, is not from Motorola, ADEQ, or does not live in M52 area? Who, by show of hands, lives above the pollution, contaminated groundwater, or would breath the toxic air from this site?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola. For the remaining questions (who represents who?), the audience responded by a show of hands.
What is Motorola's interpretation based on what you've heard at this meeting tonight?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Community is concerned about the overall proposal.

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Tom Suriano's Presentation

Page 7 of 8

Question	Response
What is the timeline?	<i>Kris Kommalan responded:</i> ADEQ has received Motorola's proposal. We are skeptically reviewing the proposal. ADEQ has not started the decision-making process because we first wanted to hear the concerns from the community.
Original agreement was that Motorola would install equipment and meet rules.	<i>Kris Kommalan responded:</i> Yes
You still have not answered the timeline question. What is the timeframe?	<p><i>Kris Kommalan responded:</i> ADEQ has spoken with Maricopa County, City of Phoenix, ADEQ Air Quality, and EPA. ADEQ is concerned about maintaining capture of the groundwater plume so we consider this an urgent matter.</p> <p><i>Kris Kommalan responded:</i> ADEQ wants to have the system back on line as soon as possible.</p>
The Superfund Program provides the rules to be followed. Follow the rules!	<i>Phil McNeely responded:</i> ADEQ intends to urge Motorola to install controls and turn on the system.
Timeframe? 30 days? 60 days? 90 days?	<i>Kris Kommalan responded:</i> ADEQ wants Motorola to install controls and restart the system as soon as possible. To make a decision, ADEQ requires more time to evaluate the proposal and the Rules, as well as time to consider community concerns.
What is the maximum time to make a decision on Motorola's proposal? What's happening to groundwater contamination?	<i>Kris Kommalan responded:</i> I don't know. ADEQ wants to hear community input and have time to consider the proposal. In the meantime, Motorola needs to get the system back on line with controls which may take approximately 3-4 weeks. ADEQ is concerned with maintaining capture of the contaminated groundwater. It has taken almost 10 years to cause the separation between OU1 and OU2 (referring

**Motorola 52nd Street Superfund Site
Community Advisory Group Meeting
June 25, 2003**

Final List of Questions & Responses: Tom Suriano's Presentation

Page 8 of 8

Question	Response
	to the September 2002 plume map). Therefore, it is in Motorola's best interest to turn the system back on and remain in compliance with the Consent Order.
If it only takes 3-4 weeks, why didn't Motorola have an alternate scrubber (temporary vapor-phase carbon canisters) installed? Then, they could have come to the community with their proposal and the system would not have to be shut down for a prolonged amount of time. The audience member questioned if Motorola was upfront with all its information.	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Motorola has always operated with the highest ethics. Motorola is operating with regulatory approval.
Has Motorola ever taken a water sample when the system was not operating? The audience member questioned how can a water sample be collected if the system is not operating?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Yes. Groundwater samples, not samples for operations. <i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> Groundwater monitoring samples are different from samples taken from the water treatment plant.
Original agreement was x times/day (no number provided). Now, Motorola is sampling only a couple of times per month. What is Motorola's cost savings for this?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> All monitoring is done in accordance with a schedule approved by ADEQ.
I am concerned about the effects of the ongoing drought. TCE is caught above the water table and will hang around because of the dropping water table. I'm concerned about that. Water table keeps dropping because of pumping actions. How can you check that? Are you checking for TCE concentrations in the soil now that the water table has dropped? Why isn't water re-circulated to keep water levels back up?	<i>Tom Suriano responded:</i> There was some general discussion regarding sampling that would be needed to confirm residuals in the soil; however, the next question came was asked during this discussion so final answer was provided on this question.